



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,687	06/29/2001	Young Ho Yim	K-298	6279
34610	7590	11/14/2006	EXAMINER	
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP P.O. BOX 221200 CHANTILLY, VA 20153			ZURITA, JAMES H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3625	

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/893,687	YIM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James H. Zurita	3625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 August 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 8-12, 15-19 and 21-50 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 8-12, 15-19 and 21-50 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Prosecution History

On 29 June 2001, applicant filed the instant application. Applicant claims priority to 37255/2000 and 372532000, both filed 30 June 2000 in the Republic of Korea.

On 3 January 2002, the application was published as PG-PUB 20020002511A1.

On 2 September 2004, the Examiner issued a restriction requirement.

On 28 October 2004, applicant elected claims 8-41 with traverse.

On 13 January 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 8-41.

On 31 March 2005, applicant amended each of claims 8-41, added claims 42-50 and cancelled non-elected claims 1-7.

On 30 August 2005, the Examiner issued a final rejection of claims 8-50.

On 30 January 2006, applicant filed an after-final amendment of claims 8, 15, 17, 18, 21, 49-40, cancelled claims 13, 14 and 20 and requested reconsideration.

On 14 February 2006, the Examiner issued an Advisory Action.

On 28 February 2006, Applicant requested continued examination.

On 24 May 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 8-12, 15-19 and 21-50.

On 23 August 2006, applicant amended claims 8, 33 and 40.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's submission of 23 August 2006 has been entered.

Applicant amended claims 8, 33 and 40.

Claims 8-12, 15-19 and 21-50 are pending and will be examined.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 23 August 2006 have been fully considered.

Objections to the drawings and the claims are withdrawn in view of amendment, applicant's explanations and their implications.

Applicant's arguments concerning Korobkin are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that

Korobkin neither discloses nor suggests that any venue type information could be made available for selection by the customer, nor that any type of custom room, or venue could be generated based on any type of requirements entered by the customer, let alone that a 2D 3D image of the venue is generated based on a purpose of the building, an inside volume, an estimated number of persons in a room, an inside material, a type of ventilation system, an internal structure, or a floor number on which the product is to be installed, as recited in independent claim 8.

In response, the Examiner respectfully notes that *Korobkin* discloses:

...In the present example, the user places a wall for the "left" side of the room. Planar rectangular structure 902 instanced from built-in library 18 is **selected by the user as a "wall" object**. Col. 30, lines 11-15, emphasis added.

Applicant argues that *Korobkin* does not provide for canceling or revising orders.

Further, *Korobkin* neither discloses nor suggests that the system includes any type of capability for revising or canceling orders. Although *Korobkin* does disclose that a PUP may be selected to place an order, *Korobkin*'s system is clearly, for the most part, directed at the contents of the graphics program used to generate the 3D images themselves, and not to the management of sales, order placement and the like. *Korobkin* neither discloses nor suggests any ability to revise or cancel orders, and thus necessarily neither discloses nor suggests receiving information required for selling the product if a purchase order for the product is received, returning to a prior step if a cancel order is received, and repeating the foregoing steps if a 2D request for a search for alternative products is received, as recited in independent claim 8.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the assertion in the Office Action that returning to a prior step and repeating the foregoing steps is an obvious modification of the system disclosed by *Korobkin*. *Korobkin*'s extensive disclosure spans 43 columns, and it is not until the final four lines of the 43rd column that *Korobkin* even alludes to the ability to make a purchase based on the 3D images generated by the system....

Korobkin neither discloses nor suggests that order placement, revision, cancellation, and other such selling related functions are necessary or critical, not that it would be advantageous to incorporate these features into the disclosed system. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that these features are not obvious.

In response, applicant's attention is respectfully directed to portions of Korobkin that disclose e-commerce web sites, merchandising, buyers, shoppers, retailers.

Applicant is respectfully directed to ***E-Commerce Merchandise Visualization and Information System***, which begins on Col. 38, line 9. E-commerce is commercial activity that takes place by means of computers connected through a network.

MICROSOFT PRESS™ Computer Dictionary.

Appellants are reminded that patents are written by and for skilled artisans. See *Vivid Technologies Inc. v. American Science and Engineering, Inc.* 200F.3d 795, 804, 53 USPQ2nd 1289, 1295 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The examiner has presumed that Appellant is a skilled artisan who possess at least ordinary skill in the art.

Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 8-12, 17-19, 23-38, 42-45, 47-50 are rejected over Korobkin.

Claims 15-16, 21-22 and 46 are rejected over Korobkin in view of Obata

Claims 39-41 are over Korobkin in view of Hansen.

Claims 8-12, 15-19, 21-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Korobkin (US 6,912,293).

As per claim 8, Korobkin discloses method(s) for operating a product selling system comprising:

providing access to a web server of a product selling enterprise through a client network. See, for example, at least Abstract, Col. 2, lines 28-50.

allowing searching for a required product. See, for example, at least Col. 6, lines 15-32.

modeling a three dimensional (3D) image of the required product (see, for example, at least Fig. 42(a), Fig. 46 and related text, and Col. 6, lines 28-47) and

displaying a corresponding 3D image of the required product on a web page (see, for example, at least Col. 40, line 65-Col. 41, line 50, Col. 42, lines 24-31);

simulating a 3D installation of the product in a venue in which the product is to be installed (see, for example, installation of a rug in a living room, as in Col. 41, lines 4-32) and

displaying the simulated 3D installation on the web page as in Col. 42, lines 58-Col. 43, line 30), wherein a 3D image of a venue is generated based on *[one of]* the purpose of a building, an inside volume, an estimated number of persons in a room, an inside material, a type of ventilation system, an internal structure, or a floor number on

Art Unit: 3625

which the product is to be installed (see, for example, at least Col. 30, lines 11-28, concerning an internal structure such as a **wall**) and

receiving information required for selling the product if a purchase order for the product is received. See, for example, at least Col. 43, lines 31-28.

As previously Officially Noticed (page 4, Office Action of 30 August 2005), without traverse and now admitted prior art, the various if-statements express merely a familiar business cycle (represented by flow-charts) for doing an old and well-known "if-then-else" decision making steps.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to include in Korobkin choices of alternatives expressed as if-statements.

One with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made would have been motivated to include in Korobkin choices of alternatives expressed as if-statements for the obvious reason that such expressions clearly present alternative conditions in ordering and purchasing.

Alternatively, Korobkin discloses combining images to show a consumer an image of what a product might look like within the room where the user might place the product, if purchased. See, for example, at least Col. 1, line 64-Col. 2, line 4. Korobkin discloses searching and researching products, as in Col. 6, lines 19-27.

Official Notice is taken that customers may change their minds about ordering and purchases. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Korobkin with general knowledge of one

Art Unit: 3625

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, such as that customers may change their minds about purchases to disclose returning to a prior step if a cancel order is received, and repeating the foregoing steps if a request for a search for alternative products is received.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to would have been motivated to combine Korobkin with general knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, such as that customers may change their minds about purchases to disclose returning to a prior step if a cancel order is received, and repeating the foregoing steps if a request for a search for alternative products is received for the obvious reason that in commerce, customers may wish to select alternate product(s) to purchase. Merchants can present other products an possibly have the customer purchase one of them.

Korobkin **does not** specifically disclose repeating the foregoing steps if a request for a search for alternative products is received. Korobkin discloses that a user may search for an alternative product, such as a rug or a wood cabinet. See, for example, at least Col. 42, lines 13-67.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to extend Korobkin to disclose repeating the foregoing steps if a request for a search for alternative products is received.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to extend Korobkin to disclose repeating the foregoing steps if a request for a search for alternative products is received for the obvious reason that by

repeating the steps and reusing computer software, a merchant can reduce the amount of software needed for an online store.

As per claim 9, Korobkin discloses that allowing searching for a required product further comprises retrieving information for a plurality of products and displaying the plurality of products and related information on the web page. See, for example, at least Figs. 46 and 48 and related text.

As per claim 10, Korobkin discloses that allowing searching for a required product further comprises receiving information related to a required product and searching for a product that falls within a required specification. See, for example, at least references to products' specific parameters, as in Col. 8, lines 27-48 Col. 11, lines 8-18.

As per claim 11, Korobkin discloses that information related to the required product includes structural information related to an installation site of the product (see, for example, at least Col. 8, lines 28-48, Col. 11, lines 8-18, concerning dimensions of a product) and an intended use of the product (see, for example, at least Col. 39, lines 43-61, which discuss the intended use of a wooden storage box, namely, storage purposes).

As per claim 12, Korobkin discloses that a product is a product which is intended to be installed and used in a building. See, for example, references to wood cabinets, wooden storage box, as in Col. 39, lines 43-61.

As per claim 17, Korobkin discloses selecting at least one product which meets requirements related to the venue information (e.g., living room); and displaying

a corresponding 3D image of the selected product on the web page after receiving the information related to the venue in which the product is to be installed (see, for example, at least Col. 40, line 65-Col. 41, line 50, where the venue is the room)

As per claim 18, Korobkin discloses selecting a 3D sample image of at least one internal structure of a building which corresponds to the venue information (see, for example, at least Figs. 40, 41, 46 and related text) displaying the 3D sample image on the web page (see, for example, at least Col. 40, line 65-Col. 41, line 50).

As per claim 19, Korobkin discloses receiving information on a venue in which the product is to be installed **after** displaying the corresponding 3D image of the required product on the web page (see, for example, at least Col. 40, line 65-Col. 41, line 50).

As per claim 23, Korobkin discloses selecting at least one product which meets requirements related to the venue information (i.e., a living room, for example); and displaying a corresponding 3D image of the selected product on the web page after receiving information related to the venue in which the product is to be installed (see, for example, at least Col. 40, line 65-Col. 41, line 50, where the venue is the room).

As per claim 24, Korobkin discloses selecting a 3D sample image of at least one internal structure of a building which corresponds to the venue information (.e.g., living room, for example) and displaying the 3D sample image on the web page (see, for example, at least Col. 40, line 65-Col. 41, line 50).

As per claim 25, Korobkin discloses simulating a 3D installation and displaying the simulated 3D installation on the web page, as noted above. Korobkin **does not** specifically include providing a drag and drop capability by which a 3D image of a product may be dragged and dropped onto a 3D image of an internal structure of a *building* displayed on the web page. As previously Officially Noticed without traverse, and now admitted prior art, drag and drop functions were old and well known at the time that applicant's invention was made.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to extend Korobkin and knowledge well within the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art to disclose providing a drag and drop capability by which a 3D image of a product may be dragged and dropped onto a 3D image of an internal structure of a *building* displayed on the web page.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to extend Korobkin and knowledge well within the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art to disclose providing a drag and drop capability by which a 3D image of a product may be dragged and dropped onto a 3D image of an internal structure of a *building* displayed on the web page for the obvious reason that drag and drop functions may permit novices as well as professionals to work faster.

As per claim 26, Korobkin discloses simulating a 3D installation and displaying the simulated 3D installation on the web page includes providing a 3D movement of the 3D product image (as in Fig. 46 and related text, and discussion of interactive user navigation. See, for example, at least Fig. 46 and related text. Korobkin **does not**

Art Unit: 3625

specifically disclose zooming in and out functions. As previously Officially Noticed without traverse and now admitted prior art, zooming in and out were old and well known at the time of applicant's invention. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include zooming functions.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made would have been motivated to include zooming functions for the obvious reason that a user may wish to see more detailed information of a venue and a product that is being purchased prior to actually purchasing the product.

As per claim 27, Korobkin discloses 3D movement are controlled by at least one input device. See at least Fig. 46 and related text, for example, concerning user-interactive movement, i.e., via an input device). Korobkin **does not** disclose zooming in and out functions. As previously Officially Noticed without traverse, now admitted prior art, zooming in and out were old and well known at the time of applicant's invention. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include zooming functions.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made would have been motivated to include zooming functions for the obvious reason that a user may wish to see more detailed information of a venue and a product that is being purchased prior to actually purchasing the product.

As per claim 28, Korobkin discloses simulating a 3D installation and displaying the simulated 3D installation on the web page further comprises allowing for

repositioning the 3D product image to adjust an installation position of the product in real time. See at least references to interactive navigation by a user, as in Fig. 46 and related text.

As per claim 29, Korobkin discloses that searching for a required product further comprises: providing access to a web page based on a classification, a classification is based on a purpose of access (see, for example, at least references to merchants' catalogs, as Col. 2, lines 5-58, where the purpose of accessing the catalogs is for purchasing a product). Korobkin discloses classifying users into multiple levels, including novices and professionals, as in Col. 6, lines 8-27. Korobkin **does not** specifically disclose selectively providing products and related information based on the classification. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to extend Korobkin to disclose selectively providing products and related information based on the classification (novice, professional, etc.). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to extend Korobkin to disclose selectively providing products and related information based on the classification (novice, professional, etc.) for the obvious reason that experts, including professionals, may wish to access advanced functions to perform their work quicker, while novices may wish to work without time constraints. By permitting access according to user classifications, the web merchant may customize virtual areas for particular groups, making it easier to purchase products.

As per claim 30, Korobkin discloses providing a first set of information for an individual, non-expert classification (See, for example, at least Col. 6, lines 8-14) and

providing a second set of information on a plurality of products and receiving additional information for an expert classification (see, for example, at least Col. 6, lines 15-48) wherein the second set of information is more detailed than the first set of information (professional CAD development tools are more detailed than 2D image and 3D models provided to novices).

As per claim 31, Korobkin discloses that the second set of information includes the first set of information. Professional CAD development tools include first set of information such 2D image and 3D models.

As per claim 32, Korobkin discloses enabling a 3D graphic representation of a selected building by using a graphic program in communication with the web page when a request for a types of buildings option is received; and placing a selected product into the enabled 3D graphic representation of a selected building for simulation of installation. See, for example, at least Figs. 6, 7 and related text, as well as Figs. 31-33 for placing a selected product, such as a rug, in the structure.

As per claim 33, Korobkin discloses *receiving* drawings of a building (see references to importing and uploading, as above);

representing the building in a 3D graphic image (see, for example, at least Col. 7, lines 3-50, importing or uploading images to the network); using a graphic program which is separate from but in communication with the web page (see, for example, at least Col. 40, line 65-Col. 41, line 50, Col. 42, lines 24-31); and

placing a 3D graphic image of a selected product into the 3D graphic image of the building for simulation of installation. See, for example, at least Figs. 31-33 and related text.

As per claim 34, Korobkin discloses comparing information related to a plurality of products stored in a data base to design drawings of a building; and selecting a product and fitting the product to an internal structure of the building on the design drawings. See, for example, references to catalogs provided by merchants, as in Col. 2, lines 83-50, and to fitting different rugs into an internal structure such as a room, as in Figs. 31-33 and related text.

As per claim 35, Korobkin discloses receiving file(s) containing design drawings which have been converted into data (see, for example, at least Col. 7, lines 3-50, importing or uploading images to the network). Korobkin **does not** specifically disclose transmitting the product fit to the internal structure in an e-mail. As previously Officially Noticed without traverse and now admitted prior art, email and attachments were old and well known at the time of applicant's invention. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to extend Korobkin and knowledge that was well within the skill of one of ordinary skill to disclose transmitting the product fit to the internal structure in an e-mail. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to extend Korobkin and knowledge that was well within the skill of one of ordinary skill to disclose transmitting the product fit to the internal structure in an e-mail for the

obvious reason that email provides a quick way to communicate and upload drawings, thereby shortening the amount of time to carry out business.

As per claim 36, Korobkin discloses that fitting the product to the internal structure of the building includes applying the product to the design drawings of the building that have been converted into data, as noted above.

Korobkin **does not** specifically disclose transmitting the product fit to the internal structure in an e-mail. As previously Officially Noticed without traverse and now admitted prior art, email and attachments were old and well known at the time of applicant's invention. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to extend Korobkin and knowledge that was well within the skill of one of ordinary skill to disclose transmitting the product fit to the internal structure in an e-mail. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to extend Korobkin and knowledge that was well within the skill of one of ordinary skill to disclose transmitting the product fit to the internal structure in an e-mail for the obvious reason that email provides a quick way to communicate and upload drawings, thereby shortening the amount of time to carry out business.

As per claim 37, Korobkin discloses selecting a product and fitting the product to the internal structure of the building includes simulating an application of a product to the internal structure of a building on the design drawings, and displaying the simulation on a web page (see, for example, at least Col. 40, line 65-Col. 41, line 50).

As per claim 38, Korobkin **does not** specifically disclose storing client information required for a purchase in a data base when a purchase order is received by the web server of the product selling enterprise. However, Korobkin discloses order transaction system in an E-commerce merchandise visualization environment, as in Col. 38, line 8-Col. 40, line 65. Korobkin discloses ordering a product, as in Col. 43, lines 32-40.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to extend Korobkin to disclose storing client information required for a purchase in a data base when a purchase order is received by the web server of the product selling enterprise. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to extend Korobkin to disclose storing client information required for a purchase in a data base when a purchase order is received by the web server of the product selling enterprise for the obvious reason that it is important to keep track of purchase orders, preferably in a database, since the information would be readily available when it comes to paying taxes on goods sold by a merchant.

As per claim 42, Korobkin discloses that the product comprises one of a heating/cooling appliance, an electronic appliance, a sink, a cupboard, furniture, lighting fixtures, interphones, elevators, or escalators. See, for example, Col 1, lines 64-Col. 2, line 4.

As per claim 43, Korobkin discloses that the product comprises a home appliance. See, for example, references to refrigerators, as in Col 1, lines 64-Col. 2, line 4.

As per claim 44, Korobkin discloses performing a calculation based on information provided and selecting an appropriate product based on a result of the calculation. See, for example, at least Col. 14, lines 35-54 concerning calculations, and Figs. 31-33 and related text for placement of rungs in an interior structure..

As per claim 45, Korobkin **does not** specifically disclose that the related information comprises a model number of the selected product. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include related information such as model number of a selected product, such as a model number for a refrigerator. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to include related information such as model number of a selected product, such as a model number for a refrigerator for the obvious reason that a model number provides an identifier used to obtain related information concerning the product, such as weight, size and capacity.

As per claim 47, Korobkin discloses that the building comprises an existing structure. See, for example, at least references to pre-existing structures, at least Col. 13, lines 18-33).

As per claim 48, Korobkin discloses that the building comprises a structure which has not yet been built. See, for example, at least references to new structures, as in Col. 18, lines 32-54.

As per claim 49, Korobkin discloses method(s) for selling a product, comprising:

providing access to a web server of a product selling enterprise (See, for example, at least Abstract, Col. 2, lines 28-50);

searching for a required product (See, for example, at least Col. 6, lines 15-32);

providing a first set of information related to the required product for an individual, non-expert classification. See, for example, at least Col. 6, lines 1-14, concerning non-experts such as a novice audience.

providing a second set of information related to the required product for an expert classification. See, for example, at least Col. 6, lines 15-19, concerning professional CAD development and collaboration.

simulating a three dimensional (3D) installation of the required product (see, for example, installation of a rug in a living room, as in Col. 41, lines 4-32) and

displaying the simulated installation on a web page. See, for example, at least Col. 30, lines 11-28, Col. 42, lines 58-Col. 43, line 30).

As per claim 49, Korobkin does not specifically disclose:

- receiving an appropriate classification from a plurality of classifications based on a purpose of access and a level of expertise.
- receiving additional information related to installation requirements for the required product including drawings of a **building** into which the required product is to be installed.
- repeating the searching, providing, receiving, and simulating steps until a purchase order is placed.

Each of these limitations is addressed below.

Korobkin discloses use of the system by what he classifies as novices and professionals. See, for example, at least Col. 6, lines 8-26. Korobkin **does not**

specifically disclose receiving an appropriate classification from a plurality of classifications based on a purpose of access and a level of expertise. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to extend Korobkin to disclose receiving an appropriate classification from a plurality of classifications based on a purpose of access and a level of expertise. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to extend Korobkin to disclose receiving an appropriate classification from a plurality of classifications based on a purpose of access and a level of expertise for the obvious reason that professionals and novices may have different needs and skill levels.

Korobkin discloses receiving additional information related to installation requirements for the required product including drawings of a room or home into which the required product is to be installed. See, for example, at least Fig. 40 and text.

Korobkin does not specifically disclose receiving additional information related to installation requirements for the required product including drawings of a **building** into which the required product is to be installed. As previously Officially Noticed without traverse and now admitted prior art, rooms are often in buildings, and that homes are often buildings. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to extend Korobkin to disclose receiving additional information related to installation requirements for the required product including drawings of a **building** into which the required product is to be installed. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to extend Korobkin to disclose receiving additional information related to

installation requirements for the required product including drawings of a *building* into which the required product is to be installed for the obvious reason that a customer may wish to see the overall effect of a product on his home.

Korobkin discloses that a user may search for an alternative product, such as a rug or a wood cabinet. See, for example, at least Col. 42, lines 13-67. Korobkin discloses searching for a product at alternate merchant sites and purchasing a product, as in Col. 43, lines 32-38. Korobkin **does not** specifically disclose repeating the searching, providing, receiving, and simulating steps until a purchase order is placed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to extend Korobkin to disclose repeating the searching, providing, receiving, and simulating steps until a purchase order is placed. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to extend Korobkin to disclose repeating the searching, providing, receiving, and simulating steps until a purchase order is placed for the obvious reason that by doing so, a merchant can increase the possibility of making a sale, possibly making more money.

As per claim 50, Korobkin discloses representing the *building* in a 3D graphic image based on the drawings received (see, for example, at least Figs. 6, 7 and related text); and positioning a 3D graphic image of a selected product in the 3D graphic image of the *building* and simulating an installation of the product in the *building* (see, for example, at least Figs. 31-33 and related text concerning placement of a selected rug in a room of a building).

Claims 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Korobkin (US 6,912,293) in view of Hansen (US 7,043,457).

As per claim 39, Korobkin does not specifically disclose that client information required for a purchase includes a type of product, a quantity of products, and a delivery due date of the product. These limitations are disclosed by Hansen (US 7043457), as in Col. 5, line 48-Col. 6, line 3, for example. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Korobkin and Hansen to disclose that client information required for a purchase includes a type of product, a quantity of products, and a delivery due date of the product. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine Korobkin and Hansen to disclose that client information required for a purchase includes a type of product, a quantity of products, and a delivery due date of the product for the obvious reason that the information is important to transact a purchase. Without the information, a merchant would not be able to discern what a customer is purchasing, or how many units of an item, or when to deliver the items, making it difficult to carry out commerce on the Web.

As per claim 40, Korobkin does not specifically disclose providing an option proportional to a total amount of money involved when the product selling enterprise receives the client information required for a purchase. This limitation is interpreted as noted above, i.e., as payment terms. The feature is disclosed by Hansen, as in Col. 8, lines 38-50. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Korobkin and Hansen to disclose additional

Art Unit: 3625

payment terms. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine Korobkin and Hansen to disclose additional payment terms for the obvious reason that business transactions may be modified according to terms of a sale. Other terms common in the art include certain percentage discount if a total is paid within 30 days, for example.

As per claim 41, Korobkin discloses that the option includes at least one of a discount ratio proportional to a total amount of money involved, separate goods, a cash rebate, and a discount ratio applicable when purchasing a product of the product selling enterprise and other enterprises associated with the product selling enterprise. See, for example, in Hansen, at least Col. 6, line 54-Col. 9, line 20, concerning purchase-negotiation process, calculation of normalized price data. See also at least Col. 8, lines 51-67, concerning purchase-negotiation and obtaining a lower market price.

Claims 15-16, 21-22 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Korobkin (US 6,912,293) in view of Obata (US 6,390,063).

As per claims 15 and 16, Korobkin discloses volumetric calculations based in input parameters, as in Col. 8, lines 28-47. Korobkin also discloses selecting products from merchant's catalogs according to venue in which products are to be installed, as in Figs. 31-33 and related text. Korobkin does not specifically disclose that the information related to the venue in which the product is to be installed includes an allowable load, receiving the allowable load when information related to the venue in which the product is to be installed is received; selecting a product which is

Art Unit: 3625

appropriate for the allowable load; and displaying the appropriate product and related information. These limitations are taught by Obata et al., US 6390063). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Korobkin and Obata to disclose that information related to the venue in which the product is to be installed includes an allowable load. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine Korobkin and Obata to disclose that information related to the venue in which the product is to be installed includes an allowable load for the obvious reason that some venues require such measurements, for example, when installing heavy equipment, it is important to know ahead of time that the floor will withstand the load of a product so that the product will not break through to lower floors, possibly hurting occupants of the lower venue.

Claims 21-22 are rejected on the same grounds as claims 15-16.

As per claim 46, Korobkin discloses that the product comprises a home appliance. See, for example, references to refrigerators, as in Col 1, lines 64-Col. 2, line 4.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 3625

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Zurita whose telephone number is 571-272-6766. The examiner can normally be reached on 8a-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Smith can be reached on 571-272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

James Zurita
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3625
11 November 2006

James Zurita
Primary Examiner